	Non-Harijans		
(*a*)	33	65	106
	...	1	...
(*b*)	5	2	1
(*c*)	20	32	30

(*d*) Some applications were rejected for insufficiency of gomal and some for non-availability of the lands required and as the Amrit Mahal Kaval has not been surrendered to the Revenue Department.

Mr. Ankam SANJEEVA SETTY.—It is stated in the answer that some applications for lands were rejected on account of non-availability of lands. How is it that some other *darkhasts* were granted?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Wherever lands were available, they were given. In other cases, lands could not be granted.

Mr. Ankam SANJEEVA SETTY.—Are not Amrut Mahal Kaval lands surrendered to the Revenue Department available for being granted?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Yes. But the lands referred to have not been surrendered. The Amrit Mahal Department wants the *kaval* for itself.

Another MEMBER.—Have any applications for grant of lands been put in by the Harijans of Santigrama Hobli?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Notice.

Mr. B. L. HUTCHE GOWDA.—I remember that some time ago Government passed orders approving of the surrender of about 83,000 acres of Amrit Mahal Kaval land to the Revenue Department. Has the order taken effect?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I cannot say.

Mr. M. B. GURULINGIAH.—Even if the existing gomal is not sufficient for the cattle in villages, will such lands be given away for cultivation?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Not ordinarily.

Mr. M. B. GURULINGIAH.—So, the lands to be retained as gomal will have some reference to the number of cattle in the village?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Yes.

Mr. M. B. GURULINGIAH.—In certain villages in which sufficient gomal is not available, small bits of assessed waste and *kharab* land have been given away for cultivation. Is it right to have given them away?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Am I to take it that all the applications which have not yet been disposed of, have been definitely rejected?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No. Some of them may still be pending.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—May I have information as to how many are pending and how many have been rejected?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I shall let the member have the particulars a little later if available.

Pay and Prospects of Primary School Teachers.

Q.—130. **Mr. B. S. VENKATANAGAPPA SETTY** (Chamarajanagar—Urban).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the number of teachers working in the primary schools of the State who have passed the S.S.L.C. or higher examinations;

(*b*) the individual pay of these teachers;

(*c*) whether it has come to their knowledge that these teachers are in no way benefited by the introduction of the new scheme though they have put in a long service in the primary school?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. J. Appaji Gowda).**—

(*a*) 393.

(*b*) Information is not readily available as to the pay of each teacher. The pay of these teachers ranges from Rs. 15 to Rs. 35 per mensem.

(*c*) The answer is in the negative.

Mr. B. S. VENKATANAGAPPA SETTY.— If primary school masters possessing higher qualifications than S.S.L.C. so desire, cannot they be transferred to middle schools?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—Such transfers can take place only in respect of promotional vacancies. As regards

direct recruitment, their names must first find a place in the Recruitment Board lists.

Mr. B. S. VENKATANAGAPPA SETTY.— Are the Government aware that primary school pupils do not stand to derive much benefit from school masters who may possess higher qualifications than S.S.L.C?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— No.

Mr. B. S. VENKATANAGAPPA SETTY.—What I meant was that for primary schools, teachers possessing very high qualifications are not essential. Therefore, why not transfer such teachers to middle schools?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—They can be transferred if the vacancies are promotional.

Mr. B. S. VENKATANAGAPPA SETTY.— Are the Government aware that many primary school teachers have been dismissed?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—That is not a supplementary question.

Mr. A.N. RAMA RAO.—Why is it that the benefit of the revised scales has not been given to the teachers as yet?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— The allocation of a large number of teachers takes naturally some time.

Mr. A. N. RAMA RAO.— In that case, will the benefit of the revised scales be given to them with retrospective effect?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— The revised scales will be given effect to as from 1st July 1941.

Another MEMBER.— Out of so many teachers, only about 600 will probably be given the new grades. All the rest go without them. Is that fair? Has it not been our prayer all along that the pay and prospects of all the lower-salaried school masters should be improved? Does it not stand to reason that the cases of those getting Rs. 15, for instance, should first be considered, others being considered later?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. M. SUBBAIYA.—Under the new arrangement, even those getting Rs. 30 will get a higher pay. Is it not?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA— Yes. They go up to Rs. 40.

Mr. M. SUBBAIYA.— Then, can they at least not be posted to middle schools?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— I have already answered that question.

Mr. M. SUBBAIYA.— Those getting Rs. 30 will no doubt get the next higher grade. But what about those getting only Rs. 15 for a long time?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— About 600 teachers will get some advancement.

Mr. M. SUBBAIYA.— The rest?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— They too will go up, as and when vacancies arise.

Mr. M. SUBBAIYA.—If all of them do not stand to benefit immediately, what is the use of revising the scales at all? Any reorganisation must benefit all, or at least such of them as are stagnating on the same pay for a long time.

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— It is not possible to give immediate benefit to each and every one, when the number of teachers involved is so large. Even as at present, the reorganization will involve an extra cost of about Rs. 2 lakhs.

Mr. SHAIK AHMED SAHIB.— Was it not decided once that no primary school master should get anything less than a living wage of Rs. 20?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— I am not aware.

Nawab SHER KHAN.— What is the pay of primary school masters in British India?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—Notice.

Mr. SHER KHAN.—Have not some of the teachers here been started even on Rs. 13?

The MINISTER for EDUCATION (Mr. J. Mahomed Imam).—That is the pay given to training substitutes only.

Mr. SHER KHAN.—Even for them, is it not too low a payment? When an ordinary peon draws a pay of Rs. 13 should not training substitutes be given something more than that?

Mr. M. N. JOIS.— From the supplementaries so far put by some of the members has it become apparent that a large number of teachers will not be benefited by the introduction of the revised scales?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— A reorganization need not necessarily benefit each and every one in the cadre.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH.— How long will it take to prepare the allocation statement?

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM.—As far as possible, it will be expedited.

Mr. Khaji SYED YUSUF SAHIB.— Instead of giving a fixed pay of Rs. 15, why not put all of them in the scale Rs. 15-1-20, so that every one might derive some benefit?

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM.— Let the reorganization proposals as already formulated come into effect first. Afterwards, we will consider how best matters can be improved.

Mr. T. M. KHAN.—Is it not necessary that every teacher should have passed at least a slightly higher class than that which he coaches up?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— Yes.

Mr. T. M. KHAN.-- Is it not possible that some peons are drawing a higher pay than the teachers to whose care our young pupils are entrusted?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— That state ment may not be completely correct.

Mr. T. M. KHAN.—Do not Secretariat peons, for instance, get Rs. 20 and Rs. 30?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— No. Only a few Jamedars may get those salaries.

Mr. T. M. KHAN.— So, is not the status of the teachers lower than that of those Jamedars?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. K. NARAYANA SETTY.— How many teachers, in all, can rest assured of promotion to higher grades?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—I cannot say that with any amount of certainty now. Some may get promotions early and others later.

Mr. H. M. GURUSWAMI GOWDA.— For what purpose is the extra expenditure of Rs. 2 lakhs referred to by the General Secretary to Government, meant to be utilised? Is it to open more schools or to improve the pay and prospects of teachers?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— For improving their pay and prospects.

Mr. H. M. GURUSWAMI GOWDA.— From the discussion that has so far taken place, are the Government convinced that Rs. 15 is too low a pay for primary school teachers and that the teachers cannot maintain themselves and their families with such a paltry sum?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—That is not a supplementary question.

Mr. H. M. GURUSWAMI GOWDA.— May I know what their pay was 20 years ago?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.— Notice.

Mr. S. N. M. RAZVI.—Are the Government aware that several educationists and others in and outside India have pointed out in their University Convocation Addresses and elsewhere that on the teacher devolves the most important duty of giving sound education to the pupils committed to his care?

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM.— Yes.

Mr. S. N. M. RAZVI.—If that is so, how can teachers be expected to discharge their duty if even a living wage is not given to them?

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM.— That is a hypothetical question.

Mr. S. N. M. RAZVI.— Is it not by laying proper foundations at the primary stage that the teachers can help the pupils to become useful citizens of the State in their later life?

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM.—Yes.

Mr. S. N. M. RAZVI.— And do the Government agree that if proper foundations are not laid at that stage, the pupils connot become useful citizens later on?

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM.—Yes. But that does not mean that proper foundations are not being laid by teachers at present.

Mr. S. N. M. RAZVI.—Very well. In view of the discussions which have taken place here so far, are the Government convinced that the pay of Rs. 15 given to a primary school teacher is absolutely inadequate?

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM.— I have already explained that after the present reorganization proposals come into effect, the question of any further improvement that may be required may be considered.

Mr. S. N. M. RAZVI.— But the danger is that in the meanwhile, the underpaid teachers may look for other means of supplementing their income, in which case the education of our children is bound to suffer.

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM.— There is perhaps no warrant for such an apprehension.

Mr. U. L. RAMACHANDRA RAO.— Are any of the teachers in Mysore and Bangalore cities also getting the same low pay of Rs. 15 at present?

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM.— Notice.

Mr. U. L. RAMACHANDRA RAO.— What is the minimum pay of teachers in the cities?

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM.—There is no minimum common to all grades of schools.

Motions for Adjournment.

The PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received notices of two adjournment motions, the first signed by Mr. Bhupalam R. Chandrasekharayya and 60 others and the second by Mr. K. Changalaraya Reddy. (The two motions were then read out). These related, respectively, to (1) allegations of disorderly conduct on the part of soldiers off duty from the 'Training and Prisoners of War Camps' near Bangalore, and (2) extension of the period of the prohibitory order issued by the District Magistrate of Kolar, under Section 39 of the Mysore Police Act, forbidding the holding of meetings, going in processions, etc., in the Gold Mining area. The President added that under Standing Order 20 (1), only one adjournment motion could be moved and discussed on one and the same day, and that he would leave it to the House to decide which of the two motions referred to might be taken up that day.

The first adjournment motion was put to the vote and received the unanimous support of the House.

The PRESIDENT then informed the House that the adjournment motion of Mr. Bhupalam R. Chandrasekharayya and others might be moved the same day after lunch hour.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY requested that his motion might be permitted to be moved on the following day.

Request for a Ruling on the Point of Order raised by Mr. F. C. Devaraj Urs, on 14th October1941.

Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA asked for the promised ruling on the issue raised earlier during the session, *viz.*, whether it was a breach oft privilege of the House for a member comment in the public press on rulings from the Chair.

The PRESIDENT said that he had been requested by Mr. N. Rama Rao and a few others to defer the ruling on the ground that they had been trying to get an understanding arrived at amongst representatives of the various sections of the House so that incidents of that kind might not occur in future.

Mr. N. RAMA RAO reported with regret that an understanding could not be arrived at and left it to the President to proceed with the matter as he thought best.

Thereupon **the PRESIDENT** gave the following ruling:—

On Thursday the 9th instant, Mr. F. C. Devaraj Urs brought to my notice in this House a statement purporting to be issued to the Press by Mr. K. Chengalaraya Reddy, Leader of the Congress Party, commenting on the ruling I gave on Tuesday, the 7th instant, disallowing an adjournment motion. As agreed to by the House, discussion on the matter took place on Saturday, the 11th.

Mr. K. Chengalaraya Reddy admitted that he had issued the statement in question to the Press. He said he did so because he could not raise the matter of disallowance again in the House, since here, under the Standing Orders, the President's ruling is final. He argued that the convention which forbids comment in the Press on the Speaker's ruling should not be held to apply to this House, since here the President is nominated, and not elected. The point was also incidentally raised that in giving the ruling I was acting not as President of the House, but as

Dewan. This is patently untenable, as I expressly declared at the time, in reply to a question from Mr. K. Chengalaraya Reddy himself, that I was giving my ruling as President, and not as Dewan.

The fact being admitted, the question before me for consideration is :

Whether the statement issued by Mr. K. Chengalaraya Reddy to the Press criticising the ruling given by the President of the House constitutes a breach of its privileges.

This issue is not new, and there are weighty precedents of which I shall refer only to two:—

(1) The ruling given by the President of the Legislative Council (Sir Mirza Ismail) at the Budget Session in 1934.

(2) The agreement arrived at by all the parties in the Indian Legislative Assembly in September 1938 and accepted by the President as being in harmony with the traditions and practice of the House.

I may here mention that quite recently the principle of privilege was affirmed in our own Legislative Council, on a motion by the Leader of the Congress party in that House complaining that a certain newspaper had attributed improper motives to members of his party in respect of supplemental questions put by them.

The present case is stronger relating, as it does, not to the action of an outsider but of a member of the House itself.

The distinction sought to be drawn between privileges of an elected and a nominated President has no force or relevancy ; for, the privilege to be upheld is not that of the President but of the House. On this point I fully agree with Sir Mirza M. Ismail's observation in his ruling of 1934.

"This action," said Sir Mirza M. Ismail, "amounts to a breach of privilege of this House and does not become the less objectionable, because of the grounds urged by the hon'ble member in support of his action.

"This salutary principle does not depend on whether the Speaker or President of such a House is an official or non-official or whether he is elected or appointed *ex-officio* or otherwise under the constitution."

I have no hesitation at all in laying down that a member of this House is not in order if he resorts to the Press or other means of publicity outside the House to criticise a ruling or order from the Chair and I rule therefore that Mr. K. Chengalaraya Reddy's action in issuing the statement in question is the breach of a privilege which all legislative bodies have guarded very jealously.

I accept Mr. K. Chengalaraya Reddy's repeated assurance that he meant no discourtesy, the more willingly as the personal aspect was never present in my own mind, and I was solely concerned with the prestige and privileges of the House of which Mr. K. Chengalaraya Reddy himself is a member.

There has been no suggestion of disciplinary action in the present case ; and now that the principle has been clearly enunciated, I sincerely hope that there never may be occasion for considering it in the future.

In regard to permitting a question to be brought up again for reconsideration, if necessary, I cannot state my attitude better than by adopting the words of Sir Abdur Rahim on the occasion cited above.

The Chair will ordinarily permit any member who wishes to make any such statement with reference to what had been said by the President by way of expression of opinion or in the form of a statement, provided the member does not wish to criticise any such statement by the President, but only seeks to elucidate any point or requests the Chair to reconsider the matter If that is borne in mind. I am sure that the Chair will ordinarily permit any such statement to be made, provided, of course, that it does not unduly interfere with the proceedings of the House.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY sought permission to say a few words with a view to elucidate one or two points arising out of the ruling just then given.

The PRESIDENT observed that the matter had already been discussed at sufficient length and that no more time need be spent on it. He, however, promised to give the member another opportunity to have a say on any points which he might wish to raise.